

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
00-5018(a)

PATENT APPLICATION NO.
09/870,084

7

Remarks

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed November 7, 2003. Applicants have amended the Specification to include the serial number and filing date of a related, co-pending patent application. Although Applicants believe all pending claims are allowable without amendment, to expedite issuance of a patent from this Application, Applicants have made clarifying amendments to independent Claims 1 and 9. These changes are not narrowing and are not considered necessary for patentability. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Claims 1-16 are Allowable over *Rangan*

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,594,766 B2 to Rangan et al. ("*Rangan*"). *Rangan* merely discloses an Internet portal that includes a personalized portal page for a user. (Column 3, Line 62, through Column 4, Line 3) According to *Rangan*, the personalized portal page is simply an individualized web page for the user that contains links to listed web pages. (Column 4, Lines 48-57; Column 5, Lines 23-40; Figure 2) When the user selects one of the links on the individualized web page to navigate to a listed web page, the Internet portal automatically sends the user's user name and password to the listed web page so that the user does not have to manually enter the user's user name and password to gain access to the listed web page. (Column 6, Lines 1-16)

In contrast, independent Claim 1 of the present Application, as amended, recites:

A method for dynamic service support comprising:
installing a portal-page service at a gateway;
installing an interface bundle at the gateway;
installing a customer service at the gateway, the customer service being based on the interface bundle;
searching, by the portal-page service installed at the gateway, for the customer service installed at the gateway;
generating, by the portal-page service installed at the gateway, a user interface for the identified customer service installed at the gateway based on the identified customer service installed at the gateway; and

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
00-5018(a)

PATENT APPLICATION NO.
09/870,084

8

generating, by the portal-page service installed at the gateway, a portal-page for the identified customer service installed at the gateway based on the user interface generated for the identified customer service installed at the gateway and the portal page service installed at the gateway.

Independent Claim 9, as amended, recites substantially similar limitations.

The Examiner asserts that the Internet portal disclosed in *Rangan* can be properly considered *an interface bundle*, the portal service provided by the Internet portal disclosed in *Rangan* can be properly considered *a customer service*, and the personalized portal page disclosed in *Rangan* can be properly considered both *a user interface* and *a portal page*, as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner.

With respect to the Examiner's assertions that the Internet portal and the portal service disclosed in *Rangan* can be properly considered *an interface bundle* and *a customer service*, as recited in independent Claim 1, *Rangan* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the portal service being *based on* the Internet portal in any manner. In addition, *Rangan* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *searching, by the portal-page service installed at the gateway, for the portal service installed at the gateway*. In *Rangan*, the Internet portal simply provides the portal service to a user when the user accesses the user's individualized web page. Nowhere does *Rangan* disclose, teach, or suggest any *searching for* the portal service, much less *searching, by the portal-page service installed at the gateway, for* the portal service. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the Internet portal and the portal service of *Rangan* clearly cannot be properly considered *an interface bundle* and *a customer service*, as recited in independent Claim 1.

With respect to the Examiner's assertion that the personalized portal page disclosed in *Rangan* can be properly considered *a user interface*, as recited in independent Claim 1, *Rangan* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *generating, by the portal-page service installed at the gateway, the personalized portal page for the identified portal service installed at the gateway based on the identified portal service installed at the gateway*. According to *Rangan*, the personalized portal page simply makes the portal service available to a user.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
00-5018(a)

PATENT APPLICATION NO.
09/870,084

9

Rangan fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *searching, by the portal-page service installed at the gateway, for the portal service*, as discussed above. Therefore, *Rangan* also necessarily fails to disclose, teach, or suggest that the portal service is, in any way, *identified*. In addition, nothing in *Rangan* even suggests *generating the personalized portal page with any particularity with respect to the portal service, much less generating the personalized portal page for the identified portal service based on the identified portal service*. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the personalized portal page of *Rangan* clearly cannot be properly considered *a user interface*, as recited in independent Claim 1.

With respect to the Examiner's assertion that the personalized portal page of *Rangan* can be properly considered *a portal-page*, as recited in independent Claim 1, *Rangan* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *generating, by the portal-page service installed at the gateway, the personalized portal page for the identified portal service installed at the gateway based on the personalized portal page generated for the identified portal service and the portal page service installed at the gateway*. As discussed above, *Rangan* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest that the portal service is, in any way, *identified*. As further discussed above, *Rangan* also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the personalized portal page being *generated for the identified portal service*. Moreover, by asserting that the personalized portal page of *Rangan* can be properly considered both the recited *user interface* and the recited *portal page*, the Examiner improperly ignores a limitation recited in independent Claim 1, namely *generating, by the portal-page service installed at the gateway, a portal-page for the identified customer service installed at the gateway based on the user interface*. According to this limitation, the recited *portal-page* and the recited *user interface* cannot be properly considered the same component, as the Examiner asserts. Furthermore, *Rangan* fails to even suggest *generating the personalized portal page based on the portal page service installed at the gateway*. Nothing in *Rangan* discloses, teaches, or suggests the recited *portal page service installed at the gateway*—and the Examiner does not point to any portion of *Rangan* that provides such disclosure—much less *generating the personalized portal page based on the portal page service installed at the gateway*. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the personalized portal page of *Rangan* clearly cannot be properly considered *a portal-page*, as recited in independent Claim 1.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
00-5018(a)

PATENT APPLICATION NO.
09/870,084

10

For at least these reasons, independent Claims 1 and 9 are patentably distinct from *Rangan*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1 and 9 and all their dependent claims by virtue of their dependencies from allowable independent claims.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
00-5018(a)

PATENT APPLICATION NO.
09/870,084

11

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Attorney for Applicants, at (972) 718-4800.

Applicants have enclosed a check in the amount of \$110 for a one-month extension of time. Applicants believe no other fee is due. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee and credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-2347 of Verizon.

Respectfully submitted,

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES
GROUP INC.

Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Joel Wall Reg. No. 25,648

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
600 Hidden Ridge Drive
Mail Code: HQE03H14
Irving, Texas 75038
CUSTOMER NO. 32127

Date: April 5, 2004